



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/926,505

11/13/2001

Urs Loher

215871US6PCT

6835

22850

7590

06/22/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

LEZAK, ARRIENNE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/926,505

Applicant(s)

LOHER ET AL

Examiner

Arrienne M. Lezak

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 and 37-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 and 37-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3 April 2006 has been entered.

2. Examiner notes that per Applicant's amendment dated 3 April 2006, Claims 1, 12, 34 & 37 have been amended, Claim 36 has been cancelled and no claims have been added. Claims not explicitly addressed herein are found to be addressed within prior Office Action dated 3 November 2005 as reiterated herein below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-35 & 37-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over extensive consideration of the teachings of US Patent Pub. US 2001/0009014 A1

Art Unit: 2143

to Savage in view of US Patent US 6,430,567 B2 to Burrige in view of US Patent US 6,173,250 B1 to Jong in further view of US Patent US 6,484,027 B1 to Mauney.

5. Regarding Claims 1, 12, 29 & 34, Savage discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network, which method includes a chat server comprising a communications module for connection with telecommunications networks, (paragraphs #0003 & #0130) in which communication participants communicate with one another by means of communications terminals, (paragraphs #0011-0023 & Claims 1-55);

which server has a table in which information about communication forums is stored, (per pending Claim 12), (paragraph #0078 – “log file”), (Examiner further notes that Savage teaches dynamic creation and allocation of conferences among the media servers as facilitated by a single dispatch server wherein it would have been obvious to incorporate a table into said dispatch server for purposes of said dynamic allocation as said conference database tables are well known in the art, (see Krishnaswamy et al. below), (Examiner further notes that Burrige teaches registration and collaboration storage/repositories (databases), (Col. 7, lines 14-67 & Col. 8, lines 1-46), wherein information such as discussion topics, target participant groups, number of participants, temporal and geographical validity, expiration and language would have been obvious to store therein);

and which server has a command module that is set up such that it is able to receive and execute commands from the said communication participants, (paragraphs #0011-0023),

the said command module enabling the said communication participants to select one of the said communication forums by means of the said commands, (paragraphs # 0012 & #0023);

the said communications module being set up such that it is able to interconnect at least two of the said communication participants who have selected a common communication forum for a round of communication, in which the said communication participants communicate by means of spoken language, (conferences), over a said telecommunications network, (Abstract; paragraphs #0007 & #0011-0013) wherein

- the command module is moreover set up such that it is able to receive over the said telecommunications networks said commands entered by the said communication participants by means of the said communication terminals, (paragraphs # 0011-0023).

6. Though Savage teaches a command module capable of management services, Savage does not specifically enumerate a chat server facilitating selection and interconnection. Burrige teaches a chat room server management functionality, (Col. 7, lines 14-67 & Col. 8, lines 1-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant to incorporate the Burrige chat room server into the Savage conferencing system in order to facilitate user collaboration, (Burrige – Col. 1, lines 37-42). Examiner notes that Savage teaches a dispatch server and a media server for facilitating communication connections, (Savage – paragraphs #0016-0020), and Burrige teaches a chat server which manages chat messaging among all, (i.e.: obviously at least two participants – as two participants is the minimum number of

Art Unit: 2143

participants required for a chat) wireless devices, (Burridge – Col. 4, lines 55-66; Col. 7, lines 14-67; & Col. 8, lines 1-46), wherein it would have been obvious to utilize the Burridge chat server to perform those functionalities already performed by one or more servers within the Savage system. Additionally, Savage teaches the ability to couple to a telecommunications network, (Savage - paragraph # 0130), such as the wireless network described within Burridge.

7. Though Savage teaches a telecommunication network capable of utilizing telephone technology which telephones obviously facilitate communication via spoken language, Examiner additionally cites Jong for Jong discloses a chat site wherein communication is initiated via a speech-controlled device, (Col. 5, lines 4-11). Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to use the Jong speech-to-text transmit system for purposes other than communication initiation, as said system serves to recognize spoken words and convert the same to text. Thus, the Jong speech-to-text functionality could easily be used in conjunction with a menu means for purposes of facilitating conferences within the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant to combine the teachings of Savage and Jong to provide reliable, high quality communications over the dedicated connections of the public telephone infrastructure, (Savage – paragraph #0003). As a wireless phone network is a public phone network, it would have been obvious to incorporate the same into the telecommunication teachings of Savage. Additionally, Examiner notes that Burridge clearly teaches wireless communication, which obviously includes cellular

Art Unit: 2143

telephones, (per pending Claim 34 – spoken language communication terminal), (Burridge – Col. 4, lines 55-66).

8. Though Savage clearly teaches a system conferencing capacity allocated according to agreements with customers, (i.e.: ISPs, etc.), who, in turn, provide access to the system to their subscribers, (i.e.: remote/wireless clients), via the ISPs websites, (Savage – paragraph #0012), wherein a subscription service clearly requires the storage of subscriber-specific information, and wherein storage of the same would have been obvious on a SIM, Examiner additionally cites Mauney which clearly teaches use of the well-known SIM with remote/wireless client collaboration, (Mauney – Col. 6, lines 8-30 & Col. 14, lines 6-30). Use of a SIM within the Savage system for mandatory verification of access conditions prior to interconnection between all clients, would have been obvious as Savage teaches a remote/wireless client and Mauney clearly enumerates the use of a SIM for remote/wireless clients, (Mauney – Fig. 4(b); Col. 6, lines 8-30; & Col. 14, lines 6-30). Examiner additionally notes, “Burridge mentions user identification information”, (Applicant’s amendment dated 3 April 2006, p. 15), wherein incorporation of a SIM would have been obvious for remote/wireless clients. Thus, Claims 1, 12, 29 & 34 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burridge & Mauney.

9. Regarding Claims 2, 13 & 43, Savage, Jong, Burridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Jong discloses a telecommunications network wherein the subscriber terminals may be wireless telephones, (obviously on a wireless network, (Jong – Col. 2, lines 65-67 & Col. 3, lines 1-4), which subscriber terminals may

Art Unit: 2143

participate in chat communication, (Jong – Col. 4, lines 57-58). Additionally, Burrridge clearly teaches wireless communication and ISDN, (Burrridge – Col. 4, lines 55-66), wherein use of a digital mobile phone network would have been obvious, (per pending Claim 43). Thus, Claims 2, 13 & 43 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

10. Regarding Claims 3, 14, 23, 33, 40 & 41, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network, wherein the communication participants select, via a menu structure, a communication forum from a list of defined communication forums or define a new communication forum, a defined communication forum being assigned a designation, designating for example a topic, (paragraphs #0011-0023, #0120 & Fig. 13). Examiner notes that the use of a menu (design) structure for conference/forum selection purposes by designation would have been obvious to incorporate within a conference-enabled web page and would obviously include any designation. Additionally, Examiner notes that SMS and USSD were well-known in the art at the time of invention by Applicant, (please see the Mills '225 and Seppanen '032 references cited herein below); and moreover, Burrridge teaches chat menus created via applets, (Burrridge – Col. 9, lines 4-30), within transmitted, (i.e.: uploaded), collaborative responses inclusive of applets, or application software, that allow a user to view and update information that is being shared by other users. As SMS was a well-known form of application software available at the time of invention by Applicant, use of the same for transmission purposes would have been



Art Unit: 2143

obvious. Thus, Claims 3, 14, 23, 33, 40 & 41 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

11. Regarding Claims 4, 15 & 24, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network, wherein the menu structure is displayed on a display of the said communications terminals, and the communication forum is selected or defined by means of operating elements of the communications terminals, (paragraphs #0011-0023, #0120 & Fig. 13). Examiner notes that the use of a menu (design) structure for conference/forum selection purposes by designation would have been obvious to incorporate within a conference-enabled web page. Thus, Claims 4, 15 & 24 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

12. Regarding Claim 5, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Jong discloses a chat site wherein communication is initiated via a speech-controlled device, (Col. 5, lines 4-11). Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to use the Jong speech-to-text transmit system for purposes other than communication initiation, as said system serves to recognize spoken words and convert the same to text. Thus, the Jong speech-to-text functionality could easily be used in conjunction with a menu means for purposes of facilitating conferences within the system. Thus, Claim 5 is found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

Art Unit: 2143

13. Regarding Claims 6, 16, 31, 32 & 37-39, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network, (paragraphs #0011-0023). Savage does not specifically enumerate communication forum participation limitations based upon assigned geographic area. Examiner notes that limitation by geographic distinction would have been obvious as such limitations are well known in the "chat room" art for purposes of chat room designation, participation and limitation. As Savage discloses a conference (chat) system, it would have been obvious to incorporate geographic limitations into the same. Additionally, Examiner notes that Burrridge teaches submission of client information to the chat server, (Burrridge – Col. 1, lines 66-67 & Col. 2, lines 1-26), (per pending Claim 31), which information would obviously include geographic location data determined by well-known means such as GPS/terrestrial-based or satellite-based receivers, (per pending Claims 32, 38 & 39), (please see Trovato '012 below), as geographical client data transmission is necessary for bi-directional/collaboration wireless communications, as taught by Burrridge. Moreover, geographic limitations are obvious and well-known, especially in wireless networks, as when one travels beyond the capability for receipt of network transmission, communication is obviously ended. Thus, Claims 6, 16, 31, 32 & 37-39 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

14. Regarding Claims 7 & 17, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses a method and apparatus for

Art Unit: 2143

facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network wherein access to a said communication forum can be denied to an interested communication participant, (paragraphs #0011-0023). Examiner notes that an interested participant may be denied in a number of ways, including non-validation, non-existence, or over capacity, all of which would have been obvious in light of the teachings of Savage.

Thus, Claims 7 & 17 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

15. Regarding Claims 8 & 18, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network wherein the said communications terminals are interconnected for a said communication round by means of conference circuit, (Abstract & paragraph #0011). Thus, Claims 8 & 18 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

16. Regarding Claims 9, 19, 28, 44 & 45, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network wherein one of the said communication participants registers for a communication forum when no other communication participant has yet selected the respective communication forum, and a round of communication between the registered communication participant and at least one other communication participant begins when this at least one other communication participant has selected the respective

Art Unit: 2143

communication forum, (Abstract & paragraphs #0011-0023), wherein a new communication forum is defined and a topic is assigned thereto, (per pending Claim 28). Additionally, Burrige teaches selection of a chat room from a menu/list, (Burrige – Col. 2, lines 7-18), wherein said list obviously includes chat room information such as topic data for both previously existing as well as new chat rooms. Moreover, in transmitting said menu to the client, Burrige obviously teaches sending information on the common forum to at least one participant before interconnecting, (per pending Claim 44), wherein said information could be any information included in the aforementioned subscriber or network database, which information obviously includes geographic distances, language and number of participants, (per pending Claim 45). Thus, Claims 9, 19, 28, 44 & 45 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrige & Mauney.

17. Regarding Claims 10 & 20, Savage, Jong, Burrige & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage is relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network. Savage does not specifically enumerate wherein one of the said communication participants registers for at least one communication forum specifying in addition at least one other communication participant as a communication partner for the respective communication forum, so that he is notified when a specified communication partner has selected a respective communication forum. Jong discloses a “chat” communication forum that includes lists of current chat participants wherein members may designate specific communication

Art Unit: 2143

partners, (Jong – Col. 5, lines 57-67 & Col. 5, lines 1-34). Examiner notes that in designating a specific communication partner, said designee will obviously notify other participants of his/her interest to participate in the communication forum by his/her joining of the same, as noted by said list. Thus, Claims 10 & 20 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

18. Regarding Claims 11 & 21, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating conferences between a plurality of participants on a network. Savage does not specifically enumerate wherein at least certain of the said communication forums have a temporally limited availability, however, the same would have been obvious in light Savage which teaches time stamping client conference participation. Examiner notes that Savage provides for a time-notification functionality in addition to a conference creation and deletion functionality wherein a temporally limited conference would be an obvious means by which to limit conference participation so as to not exceed server capacity, as a preventative means. Thus, Claims 11 & 21 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

19. Regarding Claims 22, 27 & 42, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Burrridge discloses a wireless communication network, which network could obviously a well-known GSM or a UMTS network, (Burrridge – Col. 4, lines 55-66), (also please see Trovato '012 below). Thus, Claims 22,

Art Unit: 2143

27 & 42 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

20. Regarding Claims 25, 26, 30 & 35, Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney are relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Savage discloses authorizing the at least one communication participant to the communication forum by requesting a personal access code entered by using said at least one communication terminal, (per pending Claims 25 & 35), (Savage – Fig. 1 & paragraphs #0047-0051), wherein said access code is obviously stored at a communication terminal as subscriber ID data, (per pending Claim 26), (Savage – Fig. 1 & paragraphs #0047-0051), and wherein said personal access code is checked in accordance with information of the table, (per pending Claim 30), (i.e.: Burrridge – registration information database – Col. 7, lines 52-63), (Savage – Fig. 1 & paragraphs #0047-0051). Thus, Claims 25, 26, 30 & 35 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of the combined teachings of Savage, Jong, Burrridge & Mauney.

### ***Response to Arguments***

21. Applicant's arguments filed 3 April 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made.

Art Unit: 2143

22. Regarding Applicant's prior argument that the prior art does not teach "transmitting the data of the spoken language through the chat server", Examiner notes that the combined teachings of Savage, Burridge and Jong clearly disclose interconnecting of terminals, (Savage – paragraph #0040), for communication and transmission of spoken data through a network, (Burrige – Col. 4, lines 55-66). Regarding Applicant's prior argument that media servers are not communication terminals, Examiner notes that the communication terminals are clearly meant to be the client devices, and as such read upon Applicant's claims. Regarding Applicant's prior argument that Savage teaches distribution of management tasks over different servers, Examiner disagrees noting the dispatch server functionalities (as taught by Savage) and the chat server functionalities (as taught by Burrige). Finally, regarding Applicant's prior argument that Savage does not teach uploading of a menu structure to the terminals, Examiner disagrees noting the Savage web page is sent to the client for identification purposes, wherein a client join request causes the server to send a list of information regarding other participants, (Savage – paragraphs #0047-0053). Additionally, Examiner notes that Burrige also teaches a menu structure as noted herein above.

22. Examiner's addition of the Mauney reference addresses all Applicants' arguments concerning the incorporation of the well-known SIM for participant identification, as noted herein above. In response to applicant's argument that Burrige is directed to the access of a webpage and not the interconnection of at least two terminals for communication purposes, Examiner respectfully disagrees, noting a

Art Unit: 2143

recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Moreover, Burrige clearly discloses a collaboration network with chat capabilities, (Burrige – Abstract & Col. 1, lines 60-65), which clearly read upon the “interconnection of at least two terminals for communication purposes”.

23. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant is reminded that it is the combined teachings of the cited references which read upon Applicant's claimed invention, rendering the same unpatentable. Thus, Examiner has addressed Applicant's Amendment, and has further rejected all claims, as noted herein above.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent 5,915,225 to Mills;

US Patent 5,692,032 to Seppanen;

US Patent US 6,425,012 B1 to Trovato; and




US Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arrienne M. Lezak whose telephone number is (571)-272-3916. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571)-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arrienne M. Lezak  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

AML